

### AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS

The following amendments do not constitute an admission regarding the patentability of the amended subject matter and should not be so construed. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in this or any other appropriate patent application.

Please cancel claims 34, 35, and 37 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

### REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner sets forth a requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 restricting Applicants to one of the following inventions:

I. Claims 1-33 and 36, drawn to a method, system, and computer program product for generating coordinates of corresponding building blocks, classified in class 702, subclass 19 and 22.

II. Claims 34, 35, and 37, drawn to a method for analyzing a combinatorial library, classified in class 702, subclass 19 and 22.

Applicants hereby elect Group I, claims 1-33 and 36, drawn to a method, system, and computer program product for generating coordinates of corresponding building blocks. This election is with traverse, however, because both criteria for a proper requirement have not been met insofar as the consideration of these groups together would not impose an undue burden on the Examiner. Applicants respectfully note that for a restriction requirement to be proper, (i) the invention defined by the claim groups must be independent (M.P.E.P. § 806.04) and distinct (M.P.E.P. § 806.05); and (ii) the consideration of the groups of invention in the same application must impose a serious burden on the Examiner. *See* 35 U.S.C. §121 and M.P.E.P. § 803. As evidenced by the Examiner's search classification of the claims of Groups I and II in the same class (class 702) and the same subclass (subclass 19 and 22), there would be no serious burden if restriction among these groups were not required. Accordingly, the restriction requirement among Groups I and II is improper and should be withdrawn.